

REMARKS:

I. General

Claims 1-6, 8-16 and 18 - 22 are pending in the application. Claims 7 and 17 are to be canceled. The issues in the Office Action mailed November 27, 2006 are as follows:

- Claims 1-13, 15-17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Besel.
- Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besel in view of Marcussen et al.
- Claims 14, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besel in view of Miner et al.

Applicant hereby traverses the outstanding rejections and objections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal in light of the remarks and amendments contained herein.

II. Claims 1-13, 15-17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Besel.

Claims 1, 5, 15 : Independent claims 1, 5, and 15 has been amended to clarify applicant's invention wherein the steps of wetting a portion of a cleaning medium, and then vacuum extracting that portion prior to that portion being revolved into contact with the surface to be cleaned and then wiping the surface to be cleaned with that portion.

In comparison, Besel et al teaches wetting a portion of revolving belt 134 (the portion being that part of belt 134 receiving cleaning liquid from nozzle 82N), then wiping

the portion of the wetted belt against the surface, and then vacuum extracting the soiled solution from the portion of the belt 134. *See, Fig. 6.*

As presently understood, applicant agrees with Examiner's statement that "Besel discloses a continuous process, the steps can be viewed as happening all at once or in any order, as different portions of the cleaning belt are undergoing different functions at any given time." Clearly, different portions of Besel undergo different functions at any given time. In comparison, the present claims are directed to a method wherein a given portion of the cleaning medium is wetted, vacuum extracted, and only then wiped against the surface to be cleaned. The device of Besel is incapable of performing such a method as the step of vacuum extraction occurs in Besel only after the step of wiping the wetted portion against the surface to be cleaned.

As Besel et al. does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 1 wherein the ordered wetting of a portion, then vacuum extracting the portion prior to the portion revolving into contact with the surface to be cleaned, and then wiping with said portion are repeated during a cleaning procedure, reconsideration of the rejection under 102(b) is requested.

III. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besel in view of Marcussen et al.

It is submitted that the combination of Besel and Marcussen et al, even if proper, would fail to yield all limitations of the present invention. In particular, neither Besel nor Marcussen et al. teaches or suggests the steps of spraying a portion of a revolving cleaning medium, then removing some soil and some of the cleaning liquid from the wetted portion of the cleaning medium, and then wiping the carpeted surface with the portion of the cleaning medium. Neither Besel nor Marcussen et al. teaches or suggests spraying cleaning liquid on a portion of a revolving cleaning medium and then removing some soil and some

cleaning liquid from the portion of the cleaning medium prior to wiping the portion on a carpeted surface.

IV. Claims 14, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Besel in view of Miner et al.

It is submitted that the combination of Besel and Miner et al, even if proper, would fail to yield all limitations of the present invention. In particular, neither Besel nor Miner et al. teaches or suggests the steps of spraying a portion of a revolving cleaning medium, then removing some soil and some of the cleaning liquid from the wetted portion of the cleaning medium, and then wiping the carpeted surface with the portion of the cleaning medium. Neither Besel nor Miner et al. teaches or suggests spraying cleaning liquid on a portion of a revolving cleaning medium and then removing some soil and some cleaning liquid from the portion of the cleaning medium prior to wiping the portion on a carpeted surface.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

March 27, 2007

By John F. Klos
John F. Klos
Registration No.: 37,162
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P
2100 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2112
(612) 321-2806
(612) 321-2288 (Fax)